DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 995 UD 021 068

AUTHOR Hood, Donald E.
TITLE Audit Report of the U.S. Federal District Court-Ordered Desegregation of the Dallas Independent School District - 1977-78.
INSTITUTION Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
PUB DATE 15 Jun 78
NOTE 86p.; For related documents see UD 021 069-071. Appendices may be marginally legible due to small, broken print.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Busing; *Compliance (Legal); Court Role; Desegregation Methods; Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; Magnet Schools; *Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; *School Desegregation; School Districts
IDENTIFIERS *Dallas Independent School District TX; Texas (Dallas)

ABSTRACT

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas mandated that the report to the Court by the Dallas Independent School District describing its progress toward desegregation be reviewed by an external auditor. This report presents the auditor's findings for 1977-78. The auditor reviewed the accountability report submitted by the district and conducted on-site visits to a sample of 50 schools. Findings of the audit verified district statements that progress was being made toward compliance; transportation of students was generally accepted by pupils and parents and the utilization of special resources through the creation of magnet schools was receiving the support of school administrators and teachers. Problem areas identified by the audit included the district's failure to include evidence in its report that confirmed compliance, continuing difficulties with pupil performance in reading, and a need for more community and parent involvement in some aspects of the school program. Recommendations for continuing progress toward full compliance were made. Evaluative instruments are appended. (MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

NOTE TO FACILITY
According to Don Hood, ETS, release from Dallas School District is not needed--these have been released by the Federal Court and the Dallas School District and are now in the public domain.

ED196995

AUDIT REPORT OF THE U.S. FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT-ORDERED DESEGREGATION OF THE DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, 1977-78

DONALD E. HOOD

June 15, 1978
ETS
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

UDO 2.068

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Donald E. Hood
ETS
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AUDIT REPORT OF THE U.S. FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT-ORDERED DESEGREGATION OF THE DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, 1977-78

Submitted by

DONALD E. HOOD, ED. D.

Educational Testing Service
Austin, Texas

Members of the Audit Team

MS. J. BEATRICE HALL
MS. BETTY HERRMANN
MS. MOLLIE KELLUM
MS. AURORA SOTO
MS. VIRGINIA VELEZ

June 15, 1978

Providing administrative support at Educational Testing Service:

DR. SCARVIA B. ANDERSON, Senior Vice President
DR. JAYJIA HSIA, Director, Midwestern Regional Office
DR. THEODORE R. STORLIE, Director of Research, MWRO
DR. REGINALD CORDER, Professional Associate, Western Regional Office

Providing special resources pertaining to desegregation techniques:

DR. GARLIE A. FOREHAND, Division Director, Educational Studies
DR. MAJORIE RAGOSTA, Research Psychologist, Educational Studies

Providing assistance in preparation of report drafts:

MR. JOHN E. DOBBIN, Professional Associate, Southern Regional Office

INTRODUCTION

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, issued a Final Order dated April 7, 1976, in the case of Eddie Mitchell Tasby, et al, vs. Dr. Nolan Estes, et al, Superintendent of the Dallas Independent School District (DISD). The order adopted the concepts embodied in the school desegregation plan of the educational task force of the Dallas Alliance, a tri-ethnic committee appointed by the court and drawn from the total Dallas community.

The court order of April 7, 1976, was highly specific in how the district was to be divided into sub-districts for study and reporting, the proportions of students of various ethnic groups that were to be assigned to schools of different kinds in various sub-districts, how instructional and administrative staff were to be apportioned among the schools of various types and districts, how special school facilities were to be made available widely to students of all ethnic backgrounds, how preferences of students and their parents with regard to majority-minority proportions in the schools they attend could be accommodated - to a total of fourteen major directives and more than a dozen lesser sub-directives upon which the DISD was to report its progress in an internal accountability report, filed with the court on December 15 and April 15 annually through the school year 1978-79. The DISD did indeed file such reports in December 1976, April 1977, December 1977, and April 1978. In each case, the report of the school district was arranged to match the order of the court, item for item, in sequence and format, to facilitate comparison of court-ordered performance with actual performance.

One of the conditions contained in the court order of April 7, 1976, (Section XV-B) provided for appointment of one external educational auditor. On the basis of competitive bidding, Educational Testing Service (ETS) was selected to perform the external audit function. The audit was to consist of verifying each item in the reports of the school system pursuant to compliance with the court order. Re-stated another way, the "audit" was assumed by both the school district and the external auditor to consist of an auditor's examination of the Internal Accountability Report of the D.C.S.D., and comparison of what the district says it is doing in compliance with the court order - with what the auditor has found to be true in separately collected evidence. As a consequence, the court will have before it, at one time by June 15, of each of the three school years covered by the order, an accountability report from the school district describing its progress toward complete compliance with the court order of June 7, 1976 - and an outside auditor's report covering exactly the same items and describing that auditor's conclusions about the progress of the school district toward compliance. So that the court might enjoy the greatest convenience in comparing what the school district says with what the external auditor says, this external auditor's report also is arranged to match the court order and in the internal report in both sequence of topics and in format of presentations.

There is in this report very little specialized language that will be unfamiliar to a non-technical reader - with the possible exception of names given to schools with special facilities. At every level above the primary grades, there are certain schools that have equipment - or curricula, or schedules, or teachers with specialized training - not found in all the

other schools of the district. They are special schools for which particular provisions are made to bring to them the students who need them most. In Grades 4-6, these schools with special facilities are collectively called "Vanguard" schools. In Grades 7-8, they are named "Academic" schools, and in Grades 9-12, they are known as "Magnet" schools. A Magnet high school, for example, might be one that has the special equipment and trained staff to offer computer training, while another might be a high school that offers career preparation in the creative arts.

Table of Contents

Introduction i

List of Tables vi

Summary 1

Recommendations 5

DISD Internal Accountability Reports - December 15, 1977-April 15, 1978

1. The number and percentage of pupils, by ethnicity, attending each educational center, including Vanguard Schools, Academies, and Magnet High Schools 10

2. The number and percentage of pupils, by ethnicity, being transported for desegregation purposes to 4-6 and 7-8 centers and to Vanguard schools, Academies, and Magnet high schools. 12

3. Majority to Minority Transfers

   (a) The number and percentage of pupils, by ethnicity and by school, participating in the program. 14

   (b) The transportation facilities available and the convenience of transportation 14

   (c) Efforts made by the D.I.S.D. to increase student participation in the majority to minority transfer program. 15

4. The number and percentage of Mexican-American pupils participating in the minority to majority transfer program. 16

5. The status of the following programs:

   (a) The Early Childhood Education Program (K-3) 17
   (b) 4-8 Vanguard and Academy Programs 21
   (c) 9-12 Magnet Programs 34
   (d) Bilingual Education Program 36
   (e) The Multicultural Social Studies Program (MSSP) 40

6. The number and percentage of teachers, by ethnicity, assigned full-time in each educational center, including Vanguard schools, Academies, and Magnet schools. 41

7. The progress toward affirmative action in attaining the recruiting and employment goal, including the number and percentage of new teachers and administrators, by ethnicity, engaged by the D.I.S.D. 43

8. The current status of capital outlay projects and allocation of bond issue funds in relation to the priorities and programs established by this order. 46

9. The results of the District's annual standardized achievement tests program by school, grade (grades 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, and 12), and by ethnicity. 48

10. Efforts made by the D.I.S.D. to successfully implement the order of this court with regard to parent involvement efforts, staff development programs, communications and relations with the community, student leadership training programs, and provisions for safety and security (including due process procedures). 49

Note to the Court, on Appended Material 53

Appendices 54

List of Tables

1. Parent Involvement in the K-3 Programs of Six Selected Schools 18

2. Reading Levels at All Vanguard Schools in Grades 4, 5, 6 27

3. Bilingual Schools Visited by Audit Team 37

4. Parent Attitudinal Survey 51

SUMMARY

As external auditor for the court, under the terms of the final order of April 7, 1976, of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, Educational Testing Service (ETS), Southwestern Regional Office, has audited the report to the court of the Dallas Independent School District (DISD) for the school year 1977-78. In addition, the external auditor has conducted on-site visits to a rotated sample of 50 schools to ascertain for the court certain specified conditions in those schools pertaining to condition of facilities, curricular offerings, amount and allocation of educational resources, and the involvement of schools with parents and community.

With the single exception noted below, no important difficulties were encountered by the external auditor in performance of the audit. School administrators and staff, both at the central office and in the schools, were cooperative and helpful.

The characteristics of the Dallas schools reported to the court in the audit report of June 15, 1977, generally continue to be true of the system in June of 1978. Desegregation of schools in the district is, for the most part, being implemented without difficulty. Transportation of students for the combined purposes of desegregation and equitable sharing of specialized facilities continues to be accepted by the generality of pupils and parents. The DISD system for utilization of special resources through creation of Vanguard schools, Academies, and Magnet schools, appears also to have earned the general support of school administration and teaching staff.

Overall, then, the Dallas Independent School District - as it reports to the court in its own statements of December 15, 1977 and April 15, 1978 - indeed is making progress toward compliance in most areas specified in the court order.

The reports of the district suffer a singular shortcoming, however, in the view of the external auditor. In a number of instances, the district has indeed performed well according to the order of the court - and has said that it has performed the specified function according to the order - but it has neglected to append to its report the evidence that confirms compliance. Impressive new materials designed to inform parents about certain new programs, for example, illustrate beautifully a certain kind of district performance in community relations sought by the court, but in the district's report they are passed over with a cold "have complied" notation and are nowhere appended to that report. To the extent that the district's compliance report to the court becomes an instrument for public information, then, the district does itself a disservice by omission of handsome evidence of compliance in certain areas. The fact that this evidence is shared freely with the external auditor does not, in the auditor's view, obviate a need to have it appear as a documented part of the district's own compliance report to the court.

The external auditor still finds evidence (individual test score averages) of problems with the teaching of reading. It must be noted, however, that these are worrisome problems now being encountered by schools all over the country. The DISD teaching staff and administration are well aware of this problem, are working on it, and have hopes of uncovering evidence of progress in the next general round of testing.

Some of the Dallas schools - found at every grade level, but noted particularly in early childhood centers, intermediate centers, and in schools in sparsely-populated areas - still need to invest more effort toward the involvement of community and parents in some aspect of the school program.

No test data are reported in this year's district compliance report to the court. The district-wide achievement testing program has been changed from fall administration to spring administration, thus shifting the testing originally expected in the fall of 1977 to the spring of 1978 and effectively removing achievement test results from the current round of reports to the court. There is no way that this information can be recaptured for the purpose of comparing average test performance year-to-year in the present audit report to the court.

The layman reader of the district and audit reports - indeed, even some members of the school staff and audit team - are not fully prepared to interpret in a uniform way two terms that have a central importance in compliance with the court's ruling:

(1) "Due process"

(2) "Status"

A request for the court's assistance in resolution of this semantic problem will appear in the recommendations section.

This report by Educational Testing Service is - as was its report for 1976-77 - an auditor's report. That is, it attests to the truth and accuracy of what the Dallas Independent School District has said about its own compliance with the court's order of April 7, 1976. The district has reported on its progress toward compliance with the specifics of the

court's order, and the external auditor has verified the statements of the district report, item by item, with qualifying comments. No effort has been made in this enterprise to evaluate the quality of education offered in the Dallas schools, nor has any attempt been made to generalize about the equities of the system with regard to ethnic and other cultural characteristics of pupils.

Recommendations 3 and 4 in the auditor's report of June 15, 1977 have been implemented by the district - completed and checked off. These recommendations had to do with (No. 3) the addition of reading specialists to the teaching staffs at Vanguard, Academy, and Magnet schools and (No. 4) provision of career descriptive materials for teaching personnel at Magnet schools.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The DISD should be recognized by the court, the external auditor believes, for making general progress toward full compliance with the court's order of April 7, 1976. The district's reports on its own compliance may have some shortcomings in communication, but they reflect quite accurately both intent and performance in compliance.

1. Materials that constitute evidence of compliance (pamphlets for parents, special notices and publications, visual and sound tapes, minutes of meetings, etc.) should be included as appendices in the district's own reports to the court, rather than released to the auditor separately. (It is the auditor's fear that unless such evidence is included in the district's own report it will not enter the public record with the same effect as direct reporting.)

2. If the court is interested in obtaining an evaluation of the quality of education offered by the DISD, such an evaluation is a process quite different from the current inquiry into compliance with the court's ruling on school desegregation and should be pursued separately - and preferably at another time. The process of quality evaluation in public education is a long, complex, and expenseive one, requiring much preparation and extensive public participation. It is the auditor's recommendation that first steps in any such inquiry should be postponed until after the current 3-year cycle of desegregation effort has been completed.

3. Even though the auditor has perceived a consensus of educational opinion favoring achievement testing in the fall rather than in the spring, the auditor does not recommend a DISD shift back to fall testing

at this point in the compliance inquiry. The fall testing of 1977 has been missed and cannot be retrieved. However, special efforts should be initiated as soon as possible to have district-wide test data for the spring administrations of 1978 and 1979 included in the district's final report to the court - along with appropriate statistical bridges that permit estimates of change in test performance over the total period of time under consideration in this court order.

4. Based on observations made of test scores and other data during on-site visits to a sample of schools, the district should be advised to continue - even enlarge and reenforce - its efforts in reading instruction at all levels.

5. The Dallas school district already has a sophisticated procedure for recruiting bilingual teachers for its program of bilingual instruction, but the district should be cautioned to use its sophisticated system to recruit only qualified (i.e., certified) bilingual teachers. There is a danger that in an eagerness to expand the program as rapidly as the evident need encourages, less-than-qualified teachers may be recruited.

6. The school district and the court should reach agreement upon their respective definitions of the term "status." It is the observation of the auditor that this term as it is used in the court order means "how is the district progressing toward accomplishment of the prescribed quality or condition in the schools?" As it is used in the district's reports to the court, however, the term is used to mean: "how many schools have the prescribed characteristic?" Perhaps both definitions of the term should be used, but the court and the school district should interpret each set of data in the same way.

7. Recommendation No. 2 in the auditor's report of June 15, 1977 should be repeated here. "It is recommended that the DISD continue to focus attention on the mastery of basic skills early in the educational experiences of all children. For example, the reading skills in the Vanguard, Academy, and Magnet schools were found to need strengthening."

8. So also should Recommendation No. 5 in last year's report be repeated, to the effect that the district should continue to refine its methods for recruitment and selection of students in the special schools - Vanguard, Academy, and Magnet.

DISD INTERNAL ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTS

December 15, 1977 and April 15, 1978

In its function as external auditor, Educational Testing Service began its work from the base afforded by the two documents of December and April, prepared by the district to report the extent of compliance with the court's order of April 7, 1976.

As in the first round of reporting and auditing a year ago, the auditor used a variety of techniques to verify, item by item, statements made by the district in its reports to the court. Information in quantified data form was sampled in a randomized system, but deeply enough to assure reliability of the sample. Also selected on a randomized basis were a number of topics for which data were traced back and verified in original source documents. Going one step beyond that, for certain randomly-chosen topics the data from all levels of reduction and summarization - tally sheet input to computer print-out - were bundled up and carried into interviews with people who had contributed personally to the creation and "massage" of the data. Every topic covered in the DISD reports to the court was thus verified in one or more systematic ways and the data were found to be accurate within the limits of error set by the court. In addition - and perhaps equally important - the auditor's team noted and commented upon the deep concern of the district staff for the accuracy of their data. These people want their facts and figures to be right.

One circumstance afflicts these gatherers of information about students in the Dallas schools (gives them the feeling of the prisoner of the

ancients who was doomed to keep rolling a stone uphill): the student population keeps changing. There has been noted a dramatic loss of Anglo students, whether from present day mobility of families or other causes; and thus the proportions of students of three major ethnic backgrounds projected by the court and the Dallas Alliance simply cannot be achieved because there are no longer enough Anglo students to maintain those projected proportions.

In spite of the handicaps imposed upon the school system by the realities of a modern world, then, the auditors cross-checked and randomly sampled and replicated and interviewed in review of methods and in verification of results - finding no criticisms of consequence but finding a devotion to honesty and accuracy which is a pleasure to report.

From this point onward, the remarks of the auditor depart from generalization and pertain, point by point, to the December and April reports of the DISD to the court.

1. (a) The number and percentage of pupils, by ethnicity, attending each educational center, including Vanguard Schools, Academies, and Magnet High Schools

The data presented to the court are basically accurate and substantially correct. In no instance is there a variance, positive or negative, larger than the variance allowed by the court.

A non-technical reader may be confused, however, by the minor discrepancies in data caused by use of various sources of information for different kinds of pupils and schools at different times. Data on this point appearing in the December 15, 1977, report to court were drawn from a special survey requested by the court and represented information true as of November 18, 1977, while data on other points were gathered nearly a month earlier, on October 21. The factual differences engendered by these particular differences in dates of data collection are too small to be either statistically significant or educationally important, but they need to be explained lest the careful reader worry without cause.

Having been compiled from three different and independent sources, each source supporting the other as it does, these data on the school locations and number of ethnic groups have a built-in assurance of accuracy. The three sources were: (1) the master computer print-out (Volume I, Appendix A), (2) pupil-enrollment forms prepared at all schools and examined by the auditors, and (3) independent head-counts conducted by the principals in the sample of schools actually visited by the auditing team.

(b) The number and percentage of pupils, by ethnicity, attending each educational center except Vanguard Schools, Academies, and Magnet Schools.

Appendix A of Volume I, the master computer print-out presented to the court, listed the number and percentage of pupils by ethnicity, sex, and attendance areas, by subdistrict, attending the non-Vanguard, non-Academy,

and non-Magnet schools (the "regular" or unspecialized schools). The format of the print-out, however, did not easily lend itself to the random sampling check procedures which the auditor had expected to employ in verification of the Volume I, Appendix A output. In order to rearrange the output data in a way that would accommodate the random sampling technique, the district would have had to develop and apply new systems of data collection and reduction. Such a change-over, according to Mr. Charles Lewis, principal analyst in the DISD data processing department, would be difficult, inconvenient for everyone concerned, and expensive. Therefore, with the assistance of Mr. Lewis, and Mr. Lynn Hand of the same department, an auditing procedure was applied only to the processes for collecting and reporting the data. Using a separate but real set of pupil data, the whole process - from collection of original pupil information through all the steps to computer print-outs - was observed carefully by the audit team. The process was found to be very accurate and the level of quality control high. The data reported in Volume I, Appendix A, therefore, logically can be expected to be accurate and authentic.

With declining enrollments of Anglo students in the Dallas system as a whole, ethnic balances are difficult to achieve and compliance with the court order with respect to ethnic proportions in the special schools has been only partially achieved. Vigorous recruiting efforts for the special schools continue, however, and reveal a strong intent to comply fully.

2. The number and percentage of pupils, by ethnicity, being transported for desegregation purposes to 4-6 and 7-8 centers and to Vanguard schools, Academies, and Magnet high schools.

In an effort to verify the student transportation figures as reported to the court in the district's December 15, 1977, report, the auditor randomly chose for visits by the auditing team seven (7) 4-6 and 7-8 educational centers representing the northwest, northeast, southwest, and southeast sub-districts. These seven schools, where transportation records maintained in the offices of the principals were compared with transportation data posted for them in the December report to the court, were John Q. Adams, John B. Hood, L. L. Hotchkiss, Alex Sanger, L. V. Stockard, George W. Truett, and S. L. Williams. With the exception of the Williams school, transportation figures in all the schools visited were within the 5% variance allowed by the court when compared with the data reported to the court. The "actual" figures at the Williams school showed 30 more Black students being transported than the December report to the court had shown; by the time that the April 15, 1978, data were reported to the court, the Williams school figures had been brought up to date and were well within the 5% tolerance allowance by the court.

Student transportation figures at Vanguard schools, Academies, and Magnet schools also were verified by on-site visits. In two of the Vanguard schools (Mark Twain and Maynard Jackson) actual figures differed from December-reported figures by more than the court-allowed maximum of 5% - with Twain gaining substantially in transporting Black students and losing half a dozen Black transported students. When the total number of students in a group at a school is small, gain or loss of half a dozen amounts to more than the 5%

variance allowed. Transportation figures at the three other Vanguard schools were within the 5% variance allowed.

Every Academy was also visited by a member of the audit team to verify transportation records. In three of the five Academies, actual transportation figures fell within the 5% variance from reported figures that the court allows. At O. W. Holmes school, the actual figure was 18 students (15%) higher than the reported figure, while at W. H. Atwell school the actual figure for total number of students transported was 9 students (6%) higher than the figure reported to the court in December. It is interesting to note that the transportation figures reported to the court in April of 1978 are much closer to the head-counts by auditors (in these two schools) than they had been the previous December - and well within the 5% error tolerance.

Student transportation figures for Magnet high schools were updated daily by computer, through terminals located in each of these schools. Because the information goes through this daily up-date, it is neither easy nor inexpensive to "look back" at data recalled from an earlier date - such as comparative information for the December and April dates of the reports to the court. In lieu of direct comparison of reported data with "real" data, then, the system of computer data management was tested with trial data introduced to it by normal input means and found to be highly accurate. The system even has built into it a safeguard against gross errors of input. While there is so far no infallible guard against small and random human errors of all kinds, the system appears to provide bookkeeping as error-proof as the state of the art permits.

3. Majority to Minority Transfers

(a) The number and percentage of pupils, by ethnicity and by school, participating in the program.

The sample of schools drawn from among participants in the majority to minority transfer program for the purpose of direct observation had either a high number of transferees or a low number - to maximize the possibility of observing variances between reported data and observed data. Schools selected for on-site verification of records were: (high schools) Bryan Adams and W. T. White; (middle schools) Alex W. Spence, Robert T. Hill, and John B. Hood; (elementary schools) Arthur Kramer, Preston Hollow, Martha Turner Reilly, and Richard Lagow.

Variances between reported enrollment figures and enrollments observed during on-site visits were found to be dramatically larger in the sampled high schools than in the lower schools, and greater when compared with the reports of the following April. For whatever reason, the enrollment figures for majority to minority transfers appear to be more stable and more accurately reported in the April report to the court than in the December report. The larger discrepancies found in December reports possibly may be due to a continuation of a fall period of shifting around - the transfer students have not yet completely settled down to be counted - or the schools' student accounting is just not as stable as it is later in the school year. Whatever the reason for this seasonal difference in accuracy of reporting of student transfers, the court should be aware that the transfer enrollments reported to the court in April of 1978 are accurate within the error limits.

(b) The transportation facilities available and the convenience of transportation

In the course of an audit team interview with the D.I.S.D. Director of Transportation, Mr. Travis Johnson, two minor errors were found and corrected

in the December, 1977, district report to the court: (1) the program was mistakenly identified as "minority to majority" (when the reverse was true), and (2) the number of buses used in the program was 43 rather than 47. On-site visits by members of the audit team to the facilities at the Earl Hayes Compound confirmed the district report with regard to the transportation provided for majority to minority transfers.

(c) Efforts made by the D.I.S.D. to increase student participation in the majority to minority transfer program.

The two reports of the Dallas Independent School District to the court dated December 15, 1977, and April 15, 1978, each contain a list of seven specific publications and activities that constitute a major part of the district's effort to increase participation in the majority to minority transfer program. Members of the audit team interviewed several D.I.S.D. administrators about the public information effort for this program, collected copies of news stories and advertisements from the two daily papers, reviewed display posters and school board publications. Visits by audit team members to several of the schools involved in the program revealed substantial notice given to the program on bulletin boards and provisions for long periods open to registration. Evidence collected by the audit team indicated that the district is making all the efforts it claims to promote the majority to minority program. It may, in fact, be a bit modest in these claims.

4. The number and percentage of Mexican-American pupils participating in the minority to majority transfer program.

The December 15, 1977, district report to the court noted that 36 Mexican-American children (0.2% of the total Mexican-American population in the D.I.S.D.) were taking part in the program. The report of April, 1978, listed the number as 31. In a March interview by an audit team member with the district's internal auditor, Dr. Deberie L. Adkins shared with the auditor a computer print-out with notations that explained change in status of each of the five children lost to the program.

Two different rounds of in-school, on-site visits were made to samples of receiving schools by members of the audit team to ascertain whether transportation arrangements or other school-related barriers could be standing in the way of pupil participation in this program or whether some vagary in pupil accounting could be producing spuriously low counts. In all instances, the methods of data collection and reduction are creditable and reliable. There just are not many Mexican-American students availing themselves of the minority to majority transfer program.

5. The status of the following programs:

(a) The Early Childhood Education Program (K-3)

Both the December, 1977, and April, 1978, reports of the D.I.S.D. to the court on this point say only:

> "The Early Childhood Education Program (K-3) described in the District Court's April 7, 1976, Final Order is in operation in all K-3 centers."

In the opinion of the external auditors, this is a totally insufficient report on the topic because it says nothing about the status of the early childhood education program - who it serves, what it emphasizes, how well it is succeeding, what its resources are, what its special needs may be.

In its visits to a 15-school sample of K-3 centers in the early spring of 1978, the auditor's team found a wide disparity among schools in their degrees of actual compliance with the seven specifics of Section III in the court order. At each on-site visit, records were examined for purposes of verifying pupil enrollment and teacher assignment, the curriculum content of those programs described as special, and the degree of parent and community involvement.

Table 1 presents information about six K-3 schools, illustrative of maximum and minimum parent involvement. The pupil population of each school is delineated in terms of number and ethnicity and indicates whether the school is predominantly Anglo or predominantly minority. Parent participation information was gathered in three separate areas - Partners in Reading, PTA and parent volunteers - and was charted by the number of parents involved in each of the three activities and the percentage of the total student population the involvements represent.

The first three schools listed - Titche, Macon, and Lagow - are predominantly Anglo and show a high degree of participation by parents with

Table 1

PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE K-3 PROGRAMS OF SIX SELECTED SCHOOLS

School	Pupil Population							Parent Involvement in Selected K-3 Schools					
	Anglo		Black		M-A		Total	Partners in Reading		P.T.A.		Volunteers*	
	#	%	#	%	#	%		No. Attending Conferences	% of Student Population	No. Involved	% of Student Population	No. Involved	% of Student Population
Titche	195	(78.63%)	34	(13.71%)	19	(7.66%)	248	(No Number Reported)	100.00%	140	56.45%	12	4.84%
Macon	213	(86.23%)	1	(.004%)	33	(13.36%)	247	208	84.21%	186	75.30%	20	8.10%
Lagow	393	(91.39%)	11	(2.56%)	26	(6.05%)	430	357	83.02%	143	33.26%	1	0.23%
Pease	0	(0)	882	(100%)	0	(0)	882	None	0	50	5.67%	11	1.25%
Carr	1	(.23%)	423	(95.7%)	18	(4.07%)	442	178	40.27%	32	7.24%	48	10.86%
Fannin	78	(13.78%)	83	(14.66%)	405	(71.55%)	566	491	86.75%	50	8.83%	43	7.60%

* Numbers include Parent Advisory, Volunteers, Tutors, and R.I.F. Volunteers.

respect to attendance at Partners in Reading conferences, in particular. Fannin, predominantly Mexican-American in ethnic composition, also exhibited a high degree of parental involvement in Partners in Reading conferences. Carr, predominantly Black, had parent involvement in Reading conferences to a much smaller degree, and Pease, also predominantly Black, apparently had no parent participation at all in the Partners in Reading program. The number of parents involved in PTA was, with one exception, smaller than the number involved in Partners in Reading. The exception was Pease, which had no participants in the special reading program, but approximately 50 involved in PTA. The percentage of parents serving as volunteers was below 11% at all six schools, with Carr having the highest number involved (48 or 10.86%).

Also verified was the extent of prototypic enrichment programs. The D.I.S.D. General Information Bulletin on K-3 schools and centers describes various centers and educational facilities designed to provide "peak experiences" for elementary pupils. Of the fifteen K-3 schools sampled during the 1977-78 operational year, only Dunbar was found to have no program and no application for a program submitted. Three additional schools - Arlington Park, Casa View, and Carr - have submitted prototypic enrichment program applications. Casa View and Carr do have enrichment programs once a week and listening centers respectively.

City Park had its application approved during 1977-78. Prototypic enrichment programs were in operation at all other K-3 schools sampled.

The Multicultural Social Studies Program was found to be operative at all fifteen K-3 schools sampled. Two schools - Fannin and Carr - however, reported difficulty in securing replacement parts for the Kits. Four schools having Multicultural Social Studies do not appear on the December 15, 1977, Report to the Court due to the fact that the programs

commenced after the report was written. The omission of Pease on the December 15, 1977, Report to the Court appears to be an error, since a member of the audit team verified that all K-3 classes were supplied with Kits, and that the program was handled with the social studies program.

The auditor's filling-in of K-3 program information from a sample group of schools visited is not intended to fill gaps in the D.I.S.D. report to the court, but to illustrate what reporting on the "status" of a program amounts to. There is a wealth of information on the status of the K-3 program available in the schools, but it is the function of the district to report it and the function of the auditor to verify that report. On this program (Early Childhood Education, as covered in Part III of the court's 1976 order), the D.I.S.D. report of April, 1978, is almost wholly lacking.

5. (b) 4-8 Vanguard and Academy Programs

VANGUARD SCHOOLS

The Vanguard program continues (as in 1976-1977) to be implemented at the following schools: Mark Twain, K. B. Polk, Amelia Earhart, Sidney Lanier, and Maynard Jackson.

As in the case of the discussion of the early childhood programs in the April report to the court, however, the D.I.S.D. report on the status of Vanguard schools is far from informative. What is written about these interesting schools amounts to little more than a thumbnail sketch taken from the promotion piece for each school. So, while it is by no means intended to do here the reporting job that the district report on Vanguard schools should have done, the following section by the auditor's team does attempt to illustrate the methods and content that the district report might have used to better advantage.

Through on-site visits and personal interviews with the principal, selected faculty members, and students at each of the above listed Vanguard schools, the auditor attempted to assess the "status" of the educational offerings at each educational center.

Mark Twain Fundamental School (K-6)

Mark Twain school has a teacher student ratio of 1:23 with an enrollment of 388 students in grades 4-6. Of this number, 119 (31%) are Anglo, 248 (64%) are Black, 17 (4%) are Mexican-American, and 4 (1%) are classified as "Other".

As expected in a fundamentalist approach to education, a basic curriculum of the "3R's" is strongly emphasized. Extracurriculur programs are offered in guided studies and athletics. Approximately 80-90 children are

involved in the after school program. Tutoring and computer-assisted instruction are offered, and evening classes are open to neighborhood children as well as to Vanguard students. Individualized instruction is offered via ability grouping and peer and adult tutoring. The principal acknowledged that additional volunteers are needed for tutoring.

The educational facilities were rated excellent as to external features and good for internal features.

With respect to discipline, there were two instances of corporal punishment, one Anglo and one Black student. One Black student was suspended for 1-3 days. The majority of disciplinary action relates to problems of an academic nature. These are handled primarily through the teacher's "Special Report to Parents", with a follow-up telephone call by the principal. There were approximately 50 calls between September 1, 1977, and October 31, 1977 (more than one per school day). Approximately 135 parents are involved in PTA, with an additional eleven parents involved in other capacities.

Maynard Jackson Center for Individually Guided Education (IGE)

Maynard Jackson school has a teacher-student ratio of 1:23. 4 Anglos (0.6%), 642 Blacks (98.8%), 3 Mexican-Americans (0.5%), and 1 "Other" (0.2%) comprise the 650 students enrolled. The school was found to be very clean and attractive in all respects. This IGE school provides continuous and sequential individualized instruction as needed. Peer tutoring takes place both before and after school. Twenty-three (23) students (3 Anglo, 20 Black) are involved in a Talented and Gifted program which meets three hours a day, five days a week.

The extra-curricular program at Jackson offers arts and crafts, typing, creative dance, and athletics. Eleven computer stations are available as part of the regular program and also after school.

Discipline problems are relatively few and of a minor nature. Maynard Jackson has a very active parent-adult volunteer program. The Atlantic Richfield Company supplies monetary support for the Reading Is Fundamental Program.

K. B. Polk Center for Advanced Studies

K. B. Polk Center for Advanced Studies has an enrollment of 161 regular students. Of these students, 159 are Black (98.8%), 1 is Mexican-American, and 1 is classified as "Other". In addition, there are approximately 137 students enrolled in the Talented and Gifted (TAG) program. Of these 99 are Anglo (72.3%), 34 are Blacks (24.8%), 2 are Mexican-American, and 2 are classified as "Other". The teacher student ratio for the regular program is 1:11, while the teacher student ratio for the TAG classes is 1:20. The member of the external audit team visiting Polk noted, however, that figures for teaching and support staff might not be entirely accurate.

The curricula appear to meet the needs of regular students as well as the academically talented and gifted. All students in TAG (talented and gifted group) have opportunities to demonstrate excellence in their individual projects. The principal, Toice Davis, expressed a desire for TAG students to have training in computers. Extracurricular offerings include music, camping, and swimming. Fabulous Friday programs are designed to bring guest speakers to the campus.

Disciplinary problems are minimal, and parent conferences are utilized in extreme cases. Between September 1, 1977, and October 21, 1977,

there were 20 such conferences involving nine Anglo students and 11 Black students. Parents are required to attend these conferences even if they lose a day's pay from their regular job.

The 116-member P.T.A. was reported to be very active, and many parents were involved in Parent Advisory (122) and as volunteers (80). Both the North Park Civic League and Henry S. Miller sponsor activities. Sanger Harris has donated monies to purchase books for the R.I.F. program.

The premises and buildings were found to be clean and well-kept. Facilities were rated as good with the exception of recreational facilities and sign posts, which were rated adequate. The observer from the external audit team was impressed with the easy, relaxed atmosphere of the school.

Sidney Lanier Center for the Expressive Arts

The Sidney Lanier Vanguard has a teacher-student ratio of 1:22 with a total student population of 455. The enrollment represents 88 Anglos (19.3%), 76 Blacks (16.7%), 282 Mexican-Americans (62.9%), and 9 "Other" (2%).

Externally, the school was considered to be in good to excellent condition. The observer noted many torn window shades facing the front of the building and leaks in the roof causing water in the hall of the first floor. Parking areas were rated inadequate. Internally, the building was generally rated good to excellent, with notations that restrooms needed supplies at 10:30 a.m. and the floor in the cafeteria was still littered from breakfast.

The excellent curriculum features baseline subjects - language arts, social studies, mathematics, and science - as a basis for the program. Music, art and drama play prominent roles. After-school activities are primarily in athletics. Over 36 different activities are offered every six weeks for selection during activity period.

Theater arts and science as career education courses are planned for 1978-79.

Discipline problems are limited. Approximately 50 students a day "drop in" for conferences. Parent conferences are primarily handled by teachers. Between September 1, 1977 and October 21, 1977, the principal, Dr. J. T. Thornton, had taken four children home for purposes of discipline.

Parental involvement at Sidney Lanier appears to be minimal. Fourteen parents were involved in Parent Advisory, while twenty-three served as volunteers. No figures were available for P.T.A.

Amelia Earhart Montessori School

The Amelia Earhart Montessori Vanguard has a total student population of 174, with a teacher-student ratio of approximately 1:22. There are 27 Anglos (15.5%), 98 Blacks (56.3%), 51 Mexican-Americans (29.3%), and 3 students classified as "Other". External and internal features of the school were generally considered to be excellent.

The Montessori program was originally planned on the baseline curriculum and developed from there. Their system is closely related to the Management System of D.I.S.D. Under the Montessori concept, each child has an individually designed curriculum to fit his/her needs.

Discipline appears to represent no real problem. Specific records were not available but parents are required to come to school for conferences three to four times a year according to the principal, A. M. Erickson.

Data were not available pertaining to participation by parents and community members. Zales and Steak and Ale participate in the Adopt-A-School program.

Reading Levels at All Vanguard Schools

The reading levels for all Vanguard schools including the TAG program and the regular program at K. B. Polk appear on Table 2. With the exception of children in the K. B. Polk TAG program, the great majority of Vanguard students are reading below grade level.

Table 2

READING LEVELS AT ALL VANGUARD SCHOOLS IN GRADES 4, 5, 6

School	Ethnicity	Reading Grade Level* Above	On	Below	Total Student Enrollment
Mark Twain	A	4	59	82	388 (18 students unaccounted for in breakdown)
	B	6	55	147	
	M-A	1	7	6	
	Other	1	1	1	
			Total = 370		
Maynard Jackson	A	0	4	0	650 (40 students unaccounted for in breakdown)
	B	35	142	425	
	M-A	0	2	1	
	Other	0	1	0	
			Total = 610		
K.B. Polk TAG Program	A	73	15	2	137 (13 students unaccounted for in breakdown)
	B	15	9	15	
	M-A	4	0	0	
	Other	1	0	0	
			Total = 124		
K.B. Polk Regular Program	A	0	0	0	161 (reading breakdown figures exceed enrollment figures by 8)
	B	6	34	129	
	M-A	0	0	2	
	Other	0	0	0	
			Total = 169		
Sidney Lanier	A	19	41	32	455 (7 students unaccounted for in breakdown)
	B	1	9	68	
	M-A	1	33	236	
	Other	0	3	5	
			Total = 448		
Amelia Earhart	A	13	0	12	174 (4 students unaccounted for in breakdown)
	B	10	0	85	
	M-A	7	0	40	
	Other	2	0	1	
			Total = 170		

*Reading scores were obtained from a number of different tests and represented the most current information available in each school.

ACADEMIES

The Dallas Independent School District offers five distinct programs for seventh and eighth graders through its Academy programs.

Pearl C. Anderson Career Exploration Academy

Students attending the Pearl C. Anderson Academy have a teacher-student ratio of approximately 1:17. Out of a total enrollment of 367 students, there are 108 Anglos (29.4%), 232 Blacks (63.2%), 26 Mexican Americans (7.1%), and one student classified as "Other". Enrollment shows a substantial increase over 284 in 1976-77.

The curriculum is designed to develop career awareness through investigation and exploration of fifteen major areas of the world of work as designated by the U. S. Office of Education. Field trips are extensive; 184 had been taken between the opening of school in August, 1977 and the audit team's visit at the end of February, 1978. Computer assisted instruction, paraprofessional tutoring, the math resource room, and contract teaching provide excellent reinforcement experiences.

The complete cycle of food growth was noted as particularly interesting by a member of the audit team, who verified that these courses prove attention-getters for math and reading. The High Academic Aptitude Group (HAAG) composed of 42 seventh graders and 18 eighth graders remains grouped together for the entire program. The extra-curricular program provides a club experience weekly for every child.

Discipline problems are few; only six were reported between the opening of school and the audit team's visit on February 21, 1977. Admission to the school is by application only and children apparently respond well to the honor.

The community participation program appears to be in need of improvement. P.T.A. figures were available for only the nine officers. Volunteers totaled only 6. Cullem School is looking into the possibility of participating as an adopting agency for this Academy.

Sequoyah Academy for Environmental Science

The enrollment at Sequoyah Academy has almost doubled since 1976-77. At present, there are 10 teachers and 171 students. The student population is composed of 62 Anglos (36%), 92 Blacks (54%), and 17 Mexican-Americans (10%).

The principal, Carl L. Williams, reported no discipline problems - only a couple of parent conferences via telephone.

With respect to curriculum, opportunities to study environmental science augment the baseline curriculum. The school advised the external audit team observer that High Academic Aptitude Group programs did not fit this school's program without disrupting the Science Academy. There were only nine honors program students as of March 6, 1978.

A selected sample of 48 seventh and eighth grade students showed 38 reading below grade level, according to Test of Essential Reading Skills (TERS) scores; 36 of these students were Black. Some of these students tested as low as first and second grade levels.

Although the school building is old, the audit team rated both external and internal features as being generally good. Break-ins and vandalism, however, were definitely problems at the time of the audit team's visit on March 8, 1978. The security system was to be thoroughly checked out.

Securing an adopting agency for Sequoyah is being worked on. P.T.A. participants number 56, but Anglos account for 95% of them. Only seven

parents, six of whom are Anglo, participate in the Parent Advisory Committee. An additional four serve as volunteers. Active participation by Blacks and Mexican-Americans should be sought.

Oliver Wendell Holmes Classical Academy

Oliver Wendell Holmes has a teacher-student ratio of approximately 1:16 with 15 faculty and 237 students enrolled in the Academy program. Forty-eight (20%) of the students are Anglo, while 179 (76%) are Black. There are nine(4%) Mexican-American and 1 student classified as "Other". A too-high proportion of Black students continues, although the percentage is lower than in 1976-77. Recruiting efforts to encourage attendance of more Anglos and Mexican-Americans appears to be indicated.

The curriculum emphasizes academic excellence in language arts, mathematics and science for students with a greater-than-average interest in academics. Teachers interrelate all guides and classes to broaden students' understanding of their language and heritage. A strong student leadership training program in in existence. A member of the audit team verified that 134 students were reading above grade level (36 Anglos, 95 Blacks, and 3 Mexican-Americans), while 45 were reading below grade level (7 Anglos, 35 Blacks, and 3 Mexican-Americans). The remaining 58 students were reading on grade level.

Discipline was not a real problem; twenty-two academy students (10 Anglo, and 12 Black) did receive counseling between the opening of school in the fall of 1977 and March 1, 1978.

J. C. Penney continues to function as the school's adopting agency, and provided tutors as well as furnishings for a room and other software. Parents of second-year academy students, in particular, are very active

participants, proud of their academy and its accomplishments. A total of 87 parents participate in P.T.A. while 20 serve on Parent Advisory and 20 are volunteers.

William Hawley Atwell Fundamental Academy

William Hawley Atwell has an enrollment of 649 students and 30 teachers with a teacher-student ratio of approximately 1:22. The ethnic composition of the student body includes 224 Anglos (35%), 343 Blacks (53%), 78 Mexican-Americans (12%) and 4 students classified as "Other". The observer from the external audit team noted high morale among both students and staff.

The curriculum stresses the 3 R's under a very traditional approach. Baseline language arts is currently being developed by D.I.S.D. for academies. The Mathematics program has been set in motion and appears to be successful. Field trips are few in number. Individualized instruction is available before school with a special aide and through individual teachers at other times. Honors programs for eighth grade students are available in English, Algebra, Physical Science, and French Club. The number enrolled varies between 13 and 17. Extra-curricular activities in sports and music are provided. There is also an active student leadership training program.

Discipline appears to constitute somewhat of a problem, in that 58 cases of corporal punishment involving eight Anglos, 48 Blacks and 2 Mexican-Americans, and 17 suspensions of between one and three days, involving 5 Anglos, 8 Blacks and 4 Mexican-Americans were reported to the observer from the audit team.

The external and internal features of the building were rated in excellent condition generally. The observer noted no vandalism problems, very attractive, well-tended grounds including pleasing landscaping and terraced patios.

Community participation in P.T.A. is good, with 16 officers and approximately 300 members. The Adopt-A-School program is being worked on. Volunteers number 11 in Parent Advisory (5), Volunteer (1), and Parental Involvement is ESSA (54).

Alex W. Spence Academy

Alex W. Spence Academy provides programs for deaf and special education students (104), regular middle school students (498) and TAG students (57). The teacher-student ratio for talented and gifted students is approximately 1:14. TAG students include 30 Anglos (52.6%), 19 Blacks (33%), 6 Mexican-Americans (10.5%) and 1 student classified as "Other".

The curriculum is set up so that TAG programs are conducted during the morning. Students attend regular school classes in the afternoon. In 1977-78 the TAG program was available only to seventh-graders. Both seventh and eighth graders will be able to participate in this advanced program during 1978-79. Regular students follow the seventh and eighth grade baseline curriculum. All students participate for one quarter term in Occupational Investigation, a career education course, and the principal feels it is very successful. District enrichment programs appear to be well utilized. Provision is made for after-school programs in athletics, industrial arts, homemaking and band.

Discipline problems are non-existent among TAG students. Incidences of behavior requiring disciplinary measures among the regular students totaled 83 between the opening of school in the fall of 1977 and November 9, 1977. There were 47 suspensions of one to three days (9 Anglos, 15 Blacks, 22 Mexican-Americans, and 1 "Other"), 30 parent conferences (1 Anglo, 10 Blacks, and 19 Mexican-Americans), and 5 instances of corporal punishment

involving one Anglo and 4 Blacks. In addition, one Mexican-American was placed in an alternative education program. Parent conferences had been initiated during the fall by the new assistant principal.

The external features of the building were generally rated good to excellent with one exception. The school badly needs parking areas enlarged. Internal features were generally rated good. There were no reports of vandalism.

The Founders Lions Club participates as the school's adopting agency and volunteered the services of members and their wives. With regard to P.T.A. 48 TAG parents or 84% were active. The figures for parents of other segments of the school population are considerably lower and greater participation needs to be encouraged.

The foregoing descriptions of "status" of the Vanguard and Academy programs serve the double purpose of reporting what the audit team observed in these schools and illustrating how the external audit team interprets the term "status report".

5. (c) 9-12 MAGNET PROGRAMS

The four Magnet schools created by the D.I.S.D. during the school year 1976-77 under Section V of the court order were the Business and Management Center, the High School for the Health Professions, the Transportation Institute, and the Creative Arts Magnet High School. To these original four were added two more magnet schools in the school year 1977-78: the Human Services Center and the Magnet Center for Public Services.

The D.I.S.D. April, 1978, report to the court on this program includes an accurate list of activities undertaken by the district to encourage increased enrollment in these special high school programs, but unfortunately they (the district) did not append to the report any of their attractive promotional materials.

On-site visits by members of the audit team indicated that in every Magnet high school the curriculum in each cluster continues to be modified and refined and expanded. Efforts somehow to achieve frequent individualized instruction were encountered in every magnet school. Basic academic courses required for high school graduation are offered routinely in the four original magnet high schools and are targets for the two newest schools.

Examination of enrollment figures in the magnet high schools by the audit team showed that voluntary entry into these special schools has not produced the racial balance of the court order. Only the Arts Magnet achieved the mandated balance. The numbers and proportions of Mexican-American students were sufficient in the Business, Health Professions and Transportation units, but Black and Anglo students were below predictions in number.

Especially pressing in the magnet schools is a need to strengthen the reading skills of many students. This need is a fact and it will not go away or be ignored. Since many of the students in these schools are aimed at the job market immediately after high school, reading is a crucial skill. Omission of data about the reading skills of students now in the magnet schools is an omission that should be remedied; employability in many fields depends directly upon complex reading skills learned in school.

The audit team found special interests in the magnet schools. Those schools had "new" (unfamiliar in the educational world) goals, new methods, new kinds of student bodies, new criteria for evaluation. The audit team's write-ups of the magnet schools, based on actual visits to the schools, are far more detailed in summary and (in the auditor's own eyes) far more interesting than the somewhat cryptic paragraphs provided for the court in the April, 1978, report. The district's report appears to be accurate in what it does say, but it says too little about some exciting new schools that are exploring the forward areas of what desegregation is all about.

5. (d) BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

During the 1977-1978 academic year, the Dallas Independent School District implemented the Bilingual Program in thirty-two (32) educational centers, according to the December 15, 1977, report to the court. The program focused on providing instruction for children with limited English speaking ability (LESA). Students who are eligible for program participation are those students who have been identified as lacking oral proficiency in English and/or having difficulty with the English language in regular classroom instructional activities. The Dallas Independent School District uses the Primary Acquisition of Language (PAL) test as a screening device for program eligibility.

Financial support for the implementation of the bilingual program comes primarily from two main sources: (1) the Texas Education Agency, which provides funds for instruction in grades K-5 under the Texas Bilingual Education Act; and (2) monies received under Title I, Title IV, and Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). D.I.S.D. also subsidizes the Bilingual Program through local funding. State regulations provide for Mexican-Americans who have been identified as LESA students; however, some Black and Anglo students may also participate in program activities on a voluntary basis.

The December 15, 1977, report to the court listed the names of schools and the grade levels in which the Bilingual Program was implemented. Information relative to course content, instructional techniques, teaching strategies, and instructional aids such as Audio-Visual aids was not provided as part of the report to the court. To fulfill the audit function, on-site visits were made to a randomly selected sample of nine of the

thirty-two schools in which the district's Bilingual Program was in operation. No effort was made to determine the program comprehensiveness nor adequacy as it was being implemented. Since no descriptive program information was provided by the Internal Auditor in the December 15, 1977, report, no information existed, therefore, to be verified. In an effort to gain information about program operations, interviews were conducted with principals, resource teachers, and classroom teachers in each of the nine educational centers visited. The bilingual observation form used in the audit process is included as Appendix B.

Table 3

BILINGUAL SCHOOLS VISITED BY AUDIT TEAM

School	Sub-District	Grades
James B. Bonham	Northwest	K-3
David Crockett	Northwest	K-6
Lida Hooe	Southwest	K-3
Sam Houston	Northwest	K-3
Anson Jones	Southwest	K-3
William Lipscomb	Northeast	K-3
Herbert Marcus	Northwest	4-6
Preston Hollow	Northwest	4-6
William B. Travis	Northwest	K-3

The reader is cautioned that on-site visits to each of the nine schools in the sample was made on a one-time basis. Therefore, observations could be at variance from those which could represent a more typical educational situation. In each of the educational centers visited, efforts were made to implement the bilingual program in accordance with the district's baseline curriculum. The Multicultural Social Studies Program was also being implemented at some of the schools.

At the James B. Bonham, David Crockett, Lidia Hooe, William Lipscomb, and William B. Travis schools, the small-group instructional technique was

being used to assist in language transition. Each of these schools also made use of a Spanish-English Bulletin Board designed to provide visual learning assistance to both the transitional and monolingual students. A variety of audio-visual equipment was being used to facilitate the instructional process. Parent and/or adult assistance was found to exist in one form or another in four of these five schools. William Lipscomb School reported no parent and/or adult assistance; William B. Travis School had thirty-three (33) parent and/or adults providing assistance in the instructional process, and David Crockett, James Bonham, and Lida Hooe Schools had six, six, and five parent and/or adult assistants, respectively. Teacher-made diagnostic tests and instructional materials were used at the Lida Hooe school.

The Sam Houston, Anson Jones, Herbert Marcus, and Preston Hollow Schools all had some kind of audio-visual equipment to assist in the instructional process. Herbert Marcus reported ten parent and/or adult assistants, while Preston Hollow had seven. Sam Houston had only a few parent and/or adult assistants providing instructional aids, and Anson Jones reported one adult volunteer. Peer tutoring existed at Sam Houston. Herbert Marcus had student tutors from the Greenhill School (private) approximately three times a week. Diagnostic tests and teacher-made materials were in use at Anson Jones, Sam Houston, and Preston Hollow. Some members expressed some reservations about the adequacy of available material to implement a fully individualized program at these four schools.

At each of the nine schools, Steps to English (grades 1-3) and Welcome to English (grades 1-5) were reported to be in use. Bilingual supplementary materials, developed by the D.I.S.D. were also used to facilitate the

instructional process. The number of certified bilingual teachers reported at the visited sites varied in number and ranged from a high of seven at Lida Hooe, to a total absence of certificated personnel at Crockett and Travis. The William B. Travis school does, however, have five professionals in bilingual education who are in the process of meeting certification requirements. Other educational centers having certified personnel include: William Lipscomb and Anson Jones with six fully certified and one in the process of meeting certification requirements; Sam Houston with five fully certified teachers; Preston Hollow, four certified personnel; Herbert Marcus, three certified teachers; and Williams three. Some staff members reported a belief that more qualified personnel should be allotted to the educational centers so that more individualized instruction and direct personel attention to student needs could be accomplished.

Instruction toward the D.I.S.D. goals of bilingual education - and toward satisfaction of the court order - indeed was going on in the nine schools samples by the audit team, but methods and staff and resources varied rather widely from one school to another.

5. (e) THE MULTICULTURAL SOCIAL STUDIES PROGRAM (MSSP)

The December and April reports of the district to the court on the Multicultural Social Studies Program list the schools in the district (thirty-two of them) where the program has been installed, but say nothing about the content of the program, what its purposes are, or what it has accomplished. The external auditor inquired into the nature of the program at a random sample of nine schools (out of 32 listed as having the program) and found that the program appeared to consist mainly of supplementary reading materials placed with the heads of social studies departments. No evidence as to the effectiveness of this program was available at the sample schools.

6. The number and percentage of teachers, by ethnicity, assigned full-time in each educational center, including Vanguard schools, Academies, and Magnet schools.

The responsibility of the external auditor once again was two-fold: to verify the district count of teachers by ethnicity and to verify the district count of administrators by ethnicity also. The counts to be verified were those given in the December 15, 1977, report of the D.I.S.D. to the court. The district aided the external auditor in expediting this audit by generating special computer runs that listed teachers separately from administrators and that divided both groups into sub-district lists - thus accommodating the random sampling within groups sought by the auditor.

A 5% sample of both teachers and administrators was drawn, by name and randomly within district, to verify campus assignment and ethnicity (February 14, 1978). Mr. William A. Morgan, Jr., Director of Personnel for the D.I.S.D., then drew the personnel folder of each person on each of the sample lists, and the audit team tabulated ethnicity, job assignment, and campus assignment for every name on every list in the sample. This procedure entailed the examination of personnel folders of 19 school administrators and 322 teachers in six sub-districts where 6431 full-time teachers were employed as of the date the computer printed out the sample.

There had been a small increase (87) in the number of full-time teachers in the period between the district count of staff ethnicity and assignment, but differences between the auditor's percentages obtained in a careful random sample and the percentages reported by the district - proportions of ethnicity and job assignment, by sub-district - were too

small to have significance, well below the 5% error tolerated by the court. The district's report of December 15, 1977, is to be regarded as accurate in the statistics ("Teacher Assignments by School and Ethnicity", pp. 23-30).

7. The progress toward affirmative action in attaining the recruiting and employment goal, including the number and percentage of new teachers and administrators, by ethnicity, engaged by the D.I.S.D.

On May 16 and May 18, 1978, the external auditor conducted interviews with Mr. William Morgan, Director of Personnel, and Mr. John Santillo, Assistant Superintendent for Personnel, for the purpose of verifying affirmative action in the recruitment and employment of new teachers and new administrators. During these interview sessions, recruitment and assignment practices and policies were discussed at length.

In an interview with Mr. Edward L. Cowens, Deputy Associate Superintendent - Personnel, on May 22, 1978, the auditor verified the comprehensive college/university recruiting program as evidenced by geographic recruitment schedules. An interview with Mr. Chris Carrizales, Coordinator - Elementary Schools, confirmed the comprehensive recruitment program conducted by the Dallas Independent School District. In addition to recruiting within the state of Texas, personnel interviewers traveled to Louisiana, Oklahoma, Arkansas, New Mexico, Illinois, Michigan, Nebraska, Iowa, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts in an effort to find qualified teachers. Approximately 48 colleges and universities were visited in these ten states. Recruiting efforts were not conducted in Mississippi or in Maine during the 1977-1978 operational year, as they had been during the 1976-1977 operational year. Curtailment of recruiting efforts in these states was due to a lack of interest among prospective teachers there to be employed in the D.I.S.D. Recruiting efforts, however, were expanded to include four new states (Illinois, Michigan, Nebraska, and Iowa) during the 1977-1978 recruitment season.

Special efforts also were made to recruit minority teachers (Mexican-Americans) by retaining Dr. Benita Lowery of St. Mary's University, Dr. David Hinojosa of Texas A & I University, and Dr. George Gonzales of Pan American University - as recruiting assistants.

Advertising efforts by the district included brief radio announcements regarding dates and places of interviews for minority applicants, as well as newspaper advertisements. These advertisements appeared in approximately 15 newspapers throughout the state of Texas. In addition to these media recruitment efforts, the D.I.S.D. belongs to the New England Consortium, which circulates information regarding teacher openings and interview schedules for interested applicants throughout the entire New England region.

A slide-tape presentation entitled, "We've Got What You Want", accompanied by a brochure, which together stress the multi-cultural composition of the D.I.S.D. is circulated for viewing throughout the state. In several Texas cities such as Houston, San Antonio, Victoria, and Laredo, hotel rooms are rented by personnel interviewers to facilitate the recruitment of teachers in service who find it inconvenient to attend interview centers established on college and university campuses. According to Mr. Edward Cowens, a projected total of $10,800 was spent on recruiting personnel during the 1977-1978 academic year.

The number of new teachers and administrators, by ethnicity, as reported to the court in the April 15, 1978, report was found to be correct. Verification of these figures was accomplished through interviews by the auditor with Mr. William Morgan and Mr. John Santillo. A second verification of employment figures was accomplished through the presentation of a computerized list, to the auditor, listing those new teachers (26) and new administrators

(1), by ethnicity, employed between October 1, 1977, and January 31, 1978. The computerized print-out listing new teachers employed by the district was dated February 24, 1978, and the print-out for new administrators hired by the district was generated on May 1, 1978.

In an interview with Mr. William Morgan, teacher assignment practices are made in accordance with the Singleton case. If, however, needs arise whereby the staffing of minority teachers becomes necessary for the betterment of a school program, the D.I.S.D. exercises its discretion to assign minority teachers at variance with these percentages established by Singleton.

8. The current status of capital outlay projects and allocation of bond issue funds in relation to the priorities and programs established by this order.

The D.I.S.D. reports of December 15, 1977, and April 15, 1978, listed four major site acquisition and construction projects authorized by the court order of September 23, 1976, plus fourteen maintenance and improvement projects under the district's Summer Capital Improvement Program, fifteen renovation or modernization projects approved by the Board of Education and commenced by April of 1978, twelve renovation or expansion projects completed, six new elementary schools entering the planning phase - all replacements for existing schools, and site acquisition under way for two new high schools - one of them to be a Math-Science High School.

The external auditor's review of progress on these capital outlay projects is based on a series of interviews, beginning on March 21, 1978, with fiscal officers of the district: Dr. Weldon S. Wells, Assistant Superintendent for Support Services; Mr. Kermit Key, Administrative Assistant for Support Services. These officers shared with (showed to) the audit team documentary evidence that supports in detail the April 15, 1978, D.I.S.D. report to the court. Progress on this impressive array of capital outlay projects is as the district has reported - with the two exceptions noted below.

Site selection and acquisition for the new K-3 facility in West Dallas have proceded on schedule; bids for the construction will soon be solicited. The original allocation of $905,000 for this project is expected to be exceeded substantially, however, with increase in construction costs expected to reach $1,250,000 or more.

The site for a new comprehensive high school in Seagoville has been purchased and graded. Foundation work has been completed and actual construction of the facility is under way. The original estimate of $5,300,000 for total expenditures on construction, however, is now expected to be exceeded substantially, reaching or surpassing a total of $8,500,000. Again, the large increases over costs estimated earlier are due to general inflation of construction costs, according to Dr. Wells.

9. The results of the District's annual standardized achievement tests program by school, grade (grades 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, and 12), and by ethnicity.

As it has been noted in the Summary section of this audit report, the D.I.S.D. district-wide testing program has been shifted from fall to spring administration. Such a shift has the effect of removing summary test score data from the April, 1978, report of the district and making impossible the kinds of comparisons of averages from which conclusions about group change are deduced. District-wide test score data will be available again for reporting in the December 15, 1978, report of the district to the court, but year-to-year comparisons by which to assess change will not be possible until a new bank of spring test performance data has accumulated. One useful source of pupil performance information has been greatly diminished by this shift in district-wide testing schedule in the middle of the court's three-year inquiry.

10. Efforts made by the D.I.S.D. to successfully implement the order of this court with regard to parent involvement efforts, staff development programs, communications and relations with the community, student leadership training programs, and provisions for safety and security (including due process procedures).

An impressive array of continuing activities and new activities in all of these court-ordered categories is contained in the district reports of December, 1977, and April, 1978. Interviews with appropriate school and district officers by members of the audit team, furthermore, turned up still more district efforts in most of these categories that had been omitted from the district report. In community relations and staff development, then, the district has indeed been very active in implementation of the court's order. (Their very number, and the rate at which they are revised and improved, militate against inclusion of these publications as appendices to the present audit report.)

In only one specific area did the external auditor find the language of community relations documents less than wholly clear. This is the development of the concept of "due process" as it is applied to minors in school, by school authorities. This poses some special problems, to be sure - and the D.I.S.D. bulletin, "Code of Conduct" (being rewritten), as well as Board Policy 5144 approved in August, 1977, and included in the Administrator's Manual, January, 1978, go a long way toward acceptable definition of the term by spelling out actions that may or may not be taken by the school in the event of a serious transgression by a student - but the district still needs a clear and simple definition of the term "due process".

The Parent-Student Attitudinal Survey

In order that the external auditor might obtain some "fresh" or direct evidence bearing on the way the school desegregation efforts of the district

are perceived by the parents of students involved, a short interview schedule was designed and used as the basis for interviews with a small sample of parents. The results of this survey, conducted during April, 1978, are presented in Table 4.. Twenty-four parents were selected in a way that reflected sub-district, ethnicity, and grade level. In the southwest sub-district, five samples included three Blacks and two Mexican-Americans. There were two Blacks and five Mexican-Americans in the northwest sub-district. In East Oak Cliff, four Blacks were interviewed, and in the northeast, one Black and five Mexican-Americans were asked to complete the survey. The southeast sub-district was represented by one Anglo and one Black. The 1978 sample did not call for any sample from Seagoville.

The survey, presented in questionnaire format, was composed of 18 questions. The instrument included five basic areas of concern: (1) the general educational atmosphere; (2) the degree of parental involvement; (3) the perceived progress toward desegregation; (4) the quality of the curriculum, the teachers, and the administration; and (5) the nature and scope of the extracurricular offerings. A copy of the questionnaire, containing data obtained in the interviews, appears on following pages.

The overall reaction of those sampled was generally favorable toward the court-ordered desegregation program. Parents interviewed indicated, without exception, that they were aware of the majority to minority program (#4), that they felt the desegregation plan had improved the general educational atmosphere (#5), that the curriculum was meeting both parent expectations and children's needs (#16), and that children were able to participate in extracurricular offerings (#18), and confirmed the adequacy of transportation facilities (#13).

PARENT ATTITUDINAL SURVEY

Questions	Grade Level	Responses by Ethnicity: Yes A	Yes B	Yes M/A	No A	No B	No M/A	Grand Total	Total Yes	Total No
1. Satisfaction with education progress	K-3		2	4			1			
	4-6	1	6	1						
	7-8		2	5		1				
	9-12			1				24	22	2
2. Satisfaction with desegregation implementation	K-3		1	1			4			
	4-6		3		1	1				
	7-8		1	4		1				
	9-12							23*	10	7
3. Multicultural knowledge with desegregation	K-3		2	3			1			
	4-6		6	2	1					
	7-8		2	5		1				
	9-12			1				24	21	3
4. Awareness of majority to minority program	K-3		2	5						
	4-6	1	6	1						
	7-8		3	5						
	9-12			1				24	24	0
5. Improved educational atmosphere with desegregation	K-3		2	5						
	4-6	1	6	1						
	7-8		3	5						
	9-12			1				24	24	0
6. Visitation to new school	K-3		2	5						
	4-6	1	6	1						
	7-8		3	4			1			
	9-12			1				24	23	1
7. Active participation in parent organization	K-3		1	3		1	2			
	4-6		5		1	1	1			
	7-8		3	1			4			
	9-12			1				24	14	10
8. Adequate course offerings	K-3		2	5						
	4-6	1	5	1		1				
	7-8		3	5						
	9-12			1				24	23	1
9. Adequate facilities	K-3		2	4			1			
	4-6		5	1	1					
	7-8		3	5		1				
				1				24	21	3
10. Child's satisfaction	K-3		2	5						
	4-6	1	6	1						
	7-8		3	4			1			
	9-12			1				24	23	1
11. Better teaching quality at new school	K-3		1	3			2			
	4-6		6	1	1					
	7-8		3	4						
	9-12			1				22	19	3
12. Better administrative quality at new school	K-3		2	2			1			
	4-6		5	1	1					
	7-8		3	2			3			
	9-12						1	22	16	6
13. Adequate transportation facilities	K-3		2	4						
	4-6	1	6	1						
	7-8		3	5						
	9-12			1				23	23	0
14. Fewer discipline problems at new school	K-3		1	2						
	4-6		2	1		4				
	7-8		2	1						
	9-12						1	23	13	9
15. Milder punishments at new school	K-3			3		1	2			
	4-6		2	1						
	7-8			1		2	1			
	9-12							23*	7	6
16. Adequate curriculum	K-3		2	5						
	4-6	1	6	1						
	7-8		3	5						
	9-12			1				24	24	0
17. Sufficient extracurricular offerings	K-3		2	5			1			
	4-6	1	6	1						
	7-8		3	5			1			
	9-12			1				24	22	2
18. Child's extracurricular participation	K-3		2	5						
	4-6	1	6	1						
	7-8		3	5						
	9-12			1				24	24	0

* All other responses were so varied that their tabulation did not lend itself to meaningful interpretation.

With only one or two exceptions on each question, parents responded "yes" with regard to satisfaction with their children's educational progress (#1), having visited the new school (#6), the adequacy of courses being offered (#8), their child's liking for his/her school (#10), and the extent of extracurricular offerings (#17). Highly positive reactions were also expressed with respect to gains in multicultural knowledge, the results of the desegregation plan (#3), the adequacy of educational facilities(#9), and improved teaching quality at the new school (#11). Most parents also felt that the administrative quality was better at their child's new school (#12).

A slight majority of parents sampled were active in parent organizations. Those not active were unable to be active because of commitments to work (#7).

With respect to discipline, a majority of the parents sampled felt that there were either "not fewer" or "about the same number" of discipline problems at their child's new school (#14). Seven parents felt that punishments were milder at their child's new school, while six felt that they were not milder. Ten parents felt that the punishments were about the same. One parent failed to respond.

Finally, parent reaction was mixed with respect to question #2. Ten parents felt that the desegregation plan was working as well as it should be, while seven felt that it was not. Other opinions expressed included three "not sure", one "sometimes", one "no change", one "no comment, and one had no response.

NOTE TO THE COURT, ON APPENDED MATERIAL

The external auditor was tempted many times to include as an appendix to this report some D.I.S.D. publication that illustrated an aspect of district compliance with the court order but had not been included by the district in its own report. Omissions of this kind were particularly to be noted among the attractive brochures and announcements distributed by the district to inform the community about new schools, new programs, new arrangements that make the system better for its multi-ethnic clientele. To be sure, some of these publications are currently under revision and thus not suitable for inclusion in a report to the court right now, but some officer of the school district, perhaps encouraged and reminded by an officer of the court, should carry to the court <u>every</u> new public information bulletin of the school system as soon as it comes off the press.

APPENDICES

SURVEY OF D. I. S. D. SCHOOLS

(in compliance with Court Order
CA-3-4211-C Item XV Sect; B_2).

Grade _____ to _____

Name of School _____ Principal _____

Address _____ Sub-District _____

Phone No.: _____ Capacity _____ Enrollment _____

Observer _____ Date _____

I STAFF

Teacher-Student Ratio _____ : Adult-Student Ratio: _____

	Anglo %	Black %	M-A %	Other %	Total
A. Teaching Staff					
Support Staff					
Students					

Comments _____

B. C-56 S (Composite) LIST OF STAFF

STAFF	Anglo	Black	Mexican-American	Other	Total
Principal					
Intern Admin/ Asst Principal					
Counselors					
Vocational Counselors					
Librarians					
Nurses					
Nurses Aides					
Special Ed. Teachers					
Vocational Teachers (Bonus)					
Orchestra Teacher					
Classroom Teachers					
Classroom Teachers (Bonus)					
Registrar					
Study Hall Teachers					
Military Personnel					
Min. Found. Prog. Aide					
Aides in Lieu of Teachers					
Other Teacher Aides					
Secretaries					
Library Clerks					
Attendance/ Principal Clerks					
Building/Data Processing Clerk					
Counselor Clerks					
Research & Evaluation Observer					
Campus Officers					
Comm. Relations Cluster Staff					
Dir. Development					
Resource Teachers					
Liaison					
Youth Advisor					

C. EVALUATION: D.I.S.D. Principal-Teacher Conference

Comments _____

_____

D. ASSIGNMENTS: D.I.S.D. No. _____ Principal _____ No. _____

Comments _____

_____

E. TRANSFERS: IN _____ OUT _____

Comments _____

_____

F. CERTIFICATION: All _____ Some _____ Special Teaching Permit _____

Comments _____

_____

G. DEVELOPMENT PLAN: Principal's Copy ___ Implementation ___ No. of times per year ___

Content _____

Comments _____

_____

_____

H. COUNSELORS: No. of Students Counseled Requirement ___ Exit ___ Entrance ____

Magnets ____ Career Development Centers ____ Curriculum Transfers ___

Majority-Minority Transfer _____ Minority-Majority Transfer _____

Comments _____

_____

_____

II STUDENTS

A. ATTENDANCE: Actual _____ December Report _____

B. DISCIPLINE:

	Anglo	%	Black	%	M-A	%	Other	%	Total
Corporal Punishment									
Counseling									
Parent Conferences									
Suspensions (1-3 days)									
Juvenile Court Referrals									
Alternative Ed. Programs									
Third Party									

Comments _____

C. CURRICULUM TRANSFERS

Comments _____

D. READING LEVELS

2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
10				
12				

Comments _____

E. INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTION

GRADES					
	K				
	1				
	2				
	3				
	4				
	5				
	6				
	7				
	8				
	9				
	10				
	11				
	12				

Comments _____

F. STUDENT LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM

Anglo	Black	M-A	Other	Total

Comments

G. EXTRA-CURRICULAR PROGRAM

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

Anglo	Black	M-A	Other	Total

Comments

R.O.T.C.

Comments

III. CURRICULUM

A. BASELINE SUBJECTS

	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Grades
Language Arts														
Social Studies														
Mathematics														
Science														

Comments

B. CAREER EDUCATION COURSES

	Anglo	%	Black	%	M-A	%	Other	%	Total
Industrial Cooperative Training									
Distributive Education									
Vocational Office Education									
Coop. Vocational Adv. Education									
Home Economic Coop Education									
Health Occupation									
Cosmetology									
Pre-Employment Child Care									
Auto-Mechanics									
General Contracting (CVA)									
Radio-TV									

Comments _____

C. INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION

How implemented?

Comments _____

D. HONORS

	Anglo	%	Black	%	M-A	%	Other	%	Total

Comments _____

E. FEDERALLY FUNDED PROGRAMS

E.S.E.A. TITLE I									
	II								
	III								
	IV								
	VI								
	VII								
Bilingual Reading									
Tutoring									
TITLE I Deaf Project									
Project Kids									
Career Education									

Comments _____

F. MULTI-CULTURAL STUDIES SUBJECTS

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Grades

Comments _____

_____

_____

G. PARTNERS IN READING

	Anglo	%	Black	%	M-A	%	Other	%	Total
Students									
Parents									
Parents Involvement									
Parent Advocates									
Parent Adv. Needed									

Comments _____

_____

_____

H. PHOTOTYPIC ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS

	YES	NO
Mexican American Heritage Center	____	____
Afro-American Heritage Center	____	____
Ecological Center	____	____
Oral Language Lab	____	____
Educational Tours	____	____

Comments _____

_____

_____

IV FACILITIES

MEASUREMENT SCALE

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Adequate
4. Inadequate
5. Poor

O Non-Existent
N.A. Not Applicable

OBSERVER: _____

EXTERNAL FEATURES

A. GROUNDS

1. General Appearance ___
2. Landscaping ___
3. Sidewalks ___
4. Pathways ___
5. Parking Area ___
6. Fencing ___
7. Lighting ___
8. Recreational Area ___
9. Recreational Equipment ___
10. Sign posts ___
11. Security ___
12. Garbage Receptacles ___

B. BUILDINGS

1. General Appearance ___
2. Lighting ___
3. Brickwork ___
4. Woodwork ___
5. Trimmings ___
6. Roofing ___
7. Security ___
8. Gutters ___
9. Drainage ___
10. Ducts-ventilation ___
-exhaust ___
11. Safety ___
12. Windows ___

Name of Observer _____

Date of Observation _____

INTERNAL FEATURES

C. INTERIOR

1. General Appearance
2. Lighting
3. Walls (painted)
4. Hallways
5. Lockers
6. Offices
7. Garbage Receptacles
8. Dining Facilities
9. Doors
10. Drinking Fountains
11. Space Allocation
12. Rest Rooms
13. Plumbing
14. Heating System
15. Electrical System
16. Air Conditioning
17. Ventilation
18. Stairways
19. Balconies
20. Library
21. Notice/Poster Boards
22. Furnishings
23. Storage Areas
24. Fire Exits
25. Fire Extinguishers
26. Gymnasium (Male & Female)

D. CLASSROOM

1. General Appearance
2. Lighting
3. Safety
4. Doors
5. Identification Symbols
6. Security
7. Carpeting
8. Floors
9. Waste Baskets
10. Windows
11. Ventilation
12. Heating Cooling System
13. Air Conditioning
14. Electrical Outlets
15. Equipment-Mobile
-Stationary
16. Chalkboards
17. Notice/Poster Boards
18. Cupboards
19. Bookshelves
20. Chairs
21. Desks
22. Space Allocation
23. Storage Area
24. Fire Extinguishers

V. TRANSPORTATION

ACTUAL _____ DECEMBER REPORT _____ IN _____ OUT _____

A. STUDENTS

Schools	Anglo %	Black %	M-A %	Other %	Total
Vanguards					
Academies					
Business Magnet					
Arts					
Health Professions					
Transportation					

Comments _____

B. TRANSFER PROGRAM
(Majority to Minority)

Schools					

Comments _____

C. FACILITIES

Type 72 Seater					
D.I.S.D.					
Mini-					

Comments _____

VI. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

PROGRAMS	Anglo %	Black %	M-A %	Other %	Total
P.T.A.					
P.T.S.A.					
Adopt A School					
Athletic Booster					
Parent Advisory					
Volunteer					
Parental Involvement					
Tutors					
R.I.F.					

Comments _____

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Comments _____

BILINGUAL

	ANGLO	BLACK	MEXICAN-AMERICAN	OTHER	TOTAL
Students	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Aides	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

CERTIFICATION: _____ ALL _____ IN PROCESS

LANGUAGE DOMINANCE: _____ SPANISH _____ TRANSITIONAL MAINTENANCE _____

MONOLINGUAL: _____ SPANISH _____ ENGLISH

NO. OF CLASSES: _____ IN SPANISH _____ IN ENGLISH

PROVISIONS FOR ESL:

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

ORAL WRITTEN DISD COMMERCIAL OTHER

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

MATERIALS

TYPE: AUDIOVISUAL PROGRAMMED SUPPLEMENTARY

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

	ANGLO	BLACK	MEXICAN-AMERICAN	OTHER	TOTAL
TUTORS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
PARENTS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
ADULTS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

Appendix C

DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

PERSONNEL COMPETENCE

The Dallas Independent School District strives to locate teaching and administrative personnel who have the ability, the physical, emotional, and social attributes to inspire, motivate and challenge the girls and boys for whom they are responsible. Also, these personnel should be sufficiently and adequately prepared academically.

The mission of public education is to transmit the multicultural heritage to the children through education. Educational staff members, teachers, principals, etc., are charged with the responsibility to develop intructional and process goals, and make every effort to achieve these objectives by providing students a variety of learning experiences and/or modes of learning which are structured so as to enable all students to attain the specific instructional goals of each basic area of instruction.

The Dallas Independent School District ascertains the competence of its teachers by the successful completion of the components as stated in the ten sections of the enclosed Teacher Evaluation Form. These ten categories are most comprehensive in determining the goals and objectives of the teacher's performance.

_____

Teacher's Legal Name

dallas independent school district

TEACHER EVALUATION

CONFIDENTIAL

RECOMMENDATION OF PRINCIPAL:

☐ The teacher is successfully fulfilling the instructional goals as established by Board-approved curriculum as well as meeting the Professional expectations as described in this document, and is recommended for continued employment.

☐ The teacher's success in achieving the instructional goals of the District, and/or meeting the Professional expectations as outlined in this document is marginal. Continued employment is contingent upon successfully fulfilling the requirements outlined. (Appendices will be attached to this document and shall contain prescriptive remedies for the correction of performance deficiencies as determined by the principal/evaluation team.)

☐ The teacher is unsuccessful in achieving the instructional goals of the District and/or the Professional expectations as outlined in this document and therefore is recommended for dismissal.

TEACHER'S STATEMENT:

A formal conference was held on (date)_____ with my principal.

I acknowledge that each of the Professional characteristics and instructional performances listed within was discussed and that specific suggestions were recommended. I understand that my signature below does not necessarily mean that I agree with the evaluation. I also understand that I have the right to discuss my status with the Assistant Superintendent — Personnel of the Dallas Independent School District.

Signed comments are attached by principal ☐ and/or teacher ☐

Date _____ Teacher's Signature _____

School _____ Teacher's Social Security No. _____

Principal's Signature _____

Teaching Assignment _____

Number of years of service, including this year, in this school _____

Current years of service, including this year, in the Dallas Independent School District _____

Total years of service in the teaching profession _____

Comments: _____

_____

I. PROFESSIONAL EVALUATION FORM

Teacher _____ School _____

I. PROFESSIONAL

	Successful	Marginal	Unsuccessful	COMMENTS
A. The teacher maintains a continuous effort to achieve professional improvement, attitudes, and conduct. Also, the teacher observes professional ethics; works cooperatively with the entire staff; seeks, shares, and respects ideas of others; refrains from revealing confidential information regarding pupils and their families.	☐	☐	☐	
B. The teacher supports established administrative policies and directives, and performs all required school routines and responsibilities on time.	☐	☐	☐	
C. The teacher's absences are minimal and do not significantly impede the learning progress of students.	☐	☐	☐	
D. The teacher is consistently fair and impartial; praise and criticism are based on fact; all criticism is constructive; individual pupils are not excessively criticized; the teacher avoids criticism which may result in any embarrassment.	☐	☐	☐	
E. The teacher sets an example of, and encourages, socially acceptable behavior (e.g., dress, correct usage of speech, and manner), which results in an educational climate free of disruption.	☐	☐	☐	
F. The teacher maintains an atmosphere conducive to freedom of thought and creative expression, and shows respect for pupil opinions and suggestions. He/She also fosters a positive self-concept in each pupil.	☐	☐	☐	
G. The teacher demonstrates and communicates a vital interest in and understanding of each pupil's social, emotional, physical, and intellectual growth.	☐	☐	☐	

	Successful	Marginal	Unsuccessful	COMMENTS
H. Classroom management is orderly and businesslike, and gives evidence of student knowledge of teacher expectations for routines and classroom procedure. The teacher resolves behavior problems with minimal disruptions to the learning climate and creates a teaching environment conducive to learning.	☐	☐	☐	
I. The teacher's condition of health enables the teacher to achieve the instructional goals of the District.	☐	☐	☐	
J. The teacher establishes and conducts a system of communication wherein the parents are able to interpret the periodic progress reports in terms of course goals, student level of achievement of these goals, reasons for student achievement, and means for continued progress.	☐	☐	☐	

II. INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION RATING

A. Appraisal of Original or Modified Goals (December of a school year)	☐	☐	☐
B. Attainment of Original or Modified Goals (March 31 of a school year)	☐	☐	☐

Recommended Areas for Coal Development

Exceptional Professional Accomplishments

DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

SELECTION OF PRINCIPALS

The initial step in the selection of school administrators is to invite all interested personnel to take the Leadership Training Program Examination which is given annually. A copy of this application form is enclosed. The Leadership Training Program is divided in four phases. Enclosed is a copy of the Leadership Training Program Handbook, which describes the purposes of the program, the criteria of selection, and description of the four phases of the program. The personnel who successfully complete this program are interviewed by the Assistant Superintendents-Operations, the Assistant Superintendent-East Oak Cliff, and the General Superintendent of Schools. Personnel are assigned by the General Superintendent according to the vacancies which exist at the time of selection.

Principals, Assistant Principals, Resource Administrators, and Interns are evaluated according to the procedures as outlined in the enclosed Administrators Professional Evaluation booklet.

APPLICATION FORM FOR THE
LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM
1976-1977

Date _____ (Please type or print)

A recent photograph must be attached here

Name _____

Address _____

Telephone-School _____ Telephone-Home _____

Age _____ Sex: M F Height _____ Weight _____

Ethnic Origin _____ Marital Status _____

Social Security Number _____

DALLAS EXPERIENCE

Position	School	Principal	Subjects Taught	Years

OUTSIDE EXPERIENCE

Position	School	City	Superintendent	Years

COLLEGES ATTENDED AND DEGREES RECEIVED

College and Location	Yrs. Attended	Dates	Degrees Received

State of Texas Certification ☐ Teachers ☐ Administrators ☐ Supervisors ☐ Counselors

Present Assignment: School _____ Subject _____

Position to which you aspire _____

Will you be available during the coming summer months? _____

Have you ever taken the Administrative-Supervisory Exam? _____ If so what date _____, and where is the score on file? _____

Have you ever taken the National Teachers Exam (Commons)? _____ If so what date _____, and where is the score on file? _____

Please enclose a check for $7.00 payable to the Dallas Independent School District to cover the cost of your examinations.

NOTE:

Director - Management Academy (two copies) Box 45
DEADLINE: 5 p.m. October 29, 1976

Building Principal (one copy)
Retain file copy

Appendix E

ATTITUDINAL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

ETS AUDIT - SPRING 1977

Date _____

Name_____ Address_____

Phone_____ Ethnicity_____

Subdistrict_____ Student Grade Level_____

School Transferred From _____

Kind of School: Check one. K-3 ( ); 4-5-6 ( ); 7-8 ( );
9-12 ( ); Academy ( ); Vanguard ( )

School Transferred To_____

Kind of School: Check one. K-3 ( ); 4-5-6 ( ); 7-8 ( );
9-12 ( ); Academy ( ); Vanguard ( )
Magnet ( )

1. Are you as a parent satisfied with your child's education progress at his school? Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

2. Do you feel that the desegregation plan is working as well as it should be? Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

3. Do you think that your child has benefitted in learning more about other ethnic groups through this desegration plan?
   Yes _____ No _____

4. Are you aware of the majority to minority movement currently going on within the school district? Yes _____ No _____

5. Do you think the general educational atmosphere is better now than it was before the desegregation plan began?
   Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

6. Have you visited your child's new school? Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

7. Are you active in parent organizations? Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

8. Do you feel that there are enough courses being offered at your child's school to meet his/her needs? Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

9. Do you feel that the school buildings, grounds, equipment, etc., are adequate? Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

10. Does your child like the school that he/she is attending?
    Yes _____ No _____

11. Is the quality of teaching at the new school better than the quality of teaching at the old school? Yes _____ No _____

    If not, why not? _____

12. Is the quality of the administration at the new school better than the quality of administration at the old school?
    Yes _____ No _____

    If not, why not? _____

13. Are the transportation facilities adequate? Yes _____ No _____

    If not, why not? _____

14. Are there fewer discipline problems at the new school in comparison to those discipline problems at the old school?
    Yes _____ No _____

15. Are punishments less severe at the new school? Yes _____ No _____

16. Is the curriculum at the new school meeting your expectations and your child's needs? Yes _____ No _____

    If not, why not? _____

17. Are the extracurricular offerings at the school sufficient?
    Yes _____ No _____

    If not, why not? _____

18. Is your child able to participate in these extracurricular offerings? Yes _____ No _____

    If not, why not? _____

ADDENDUM

After the June 1_, 1978, Audit Report of the U.S. Federal District Court-Ordered Desegregation of the Dallas Independent School District was submitted to the court, the external auditor was supplied with additional information which necessitated an addendum to the original report. The Personnel Department of the DISD reported finding information on page 39 of the external audit report pertaining to the certification of personnel in bilingual education that was in variance to that stored in the personnel files of the district. Members of the audit team obtained the original information included in the report to the court from building administrators and files within each educational center during on-site visits. The DISD was requested to retrieve the personnel files of all staff members assigned to bilingual education in the nine schools included in the external audit. An examination of those records did reveal a variance. The following table reflects the data obtained from personnel records and information reported by the auditor.

DISD BILINGUAL CERTIFIED AND NON-CERTIFIED
PERSONNEL AND SITE ASSIGNMENT

SCHOOL	NUMBER CERTIFIED	NUMBER NON-CERTIFIED
James B. Bonham	4 (4)*	0 (0)*
David Crockett	6 (0)	0 (0)
Lida Hooe	4 (7)	0 (0)
Sam Houston	8 (4)	0 (0)
Preston Hollow	2 (4)	0 (0)
Anson Jones	5 (6)	1 (1)
William Lipscomb	8 (6)	0 (1)
Herbert Marcus	3 (3)	0 (1)
William B. Travis	9 (0)	3 (5)

* The numbers in parenthesis indicate the external audit team findings during on-site visits by an examination of campus records.

An examination of the original date obtained from the s: ols in on-site audit visits revealed that during the data reduction process, a symbol was inadvertently misinterpreted for Crockett; the symbol should have read "all" instead of "none". An inspection of the individual personnel records revealed that the total number of certified bilingual personnel at each of the nine schools ranged from a high of nine at William B. Travis to a low of two at Preston Hollow.

There is logical rationale for the discrepancies in the audit report to the court when compared with the information stored in the Personnel Division at the central administration building. The Personnel Department provides all certification data to the local campus administrators once during late August of each operational year. Such data are reported on a Personnel Utilization Form (PUF) which lists each staff member by name, academic areas for which he/she is certified, and campus assignment. There are no provisions for updating and providing current information to each campus during the school year. Therefore, discrepancies would be expected in information obtained during an on-site visit when compared to that contained in the personnel files at the central administration building.

The external auditor recommends that the DISD explore the possibilities of improving the present system. The operational techniques utilized by Mr. Clinton Schumacher and staff in the DISD Data Processing Division could possibly provide the necessary assistance in gathering, storing, and retrieving personnel information so that continuous updated information would be available.